Without entering into^ the details of this controversy between *Mayavadins* and" *Pannamamdins,* I may state tliat one apparent contradiction in the *Maya* theory is that for the individual soul to be subject to illusion, it must first ^xtgt_exist as a reality and not as an illusionary thing : but this real existence of the individual as such cannot of course be admitted by believers in the *Maya* theory, as it conflicts, according to them/with the perfect non-duality of Brahman. According to them, the very existence of the individual is constituted by ' *amdya*[f] and neither in the" state of bondage nor in that of liberation, does the individual really exist, so that *amdya* or illusion in all its forms must» .consistently with this theory, be held to belong to *Iswara'* however, incomprehensible, and unmeaning such a proposition may be. How can there be any delusion at **all** if there is no one to be deluded ?

Again, the advocates of the *Maya* theory seem to lose sight of one important fact that a power in God, be it *Maya-sakti* or any other, must be a real power and that cosmic; changes are its effect, *i.e.,* forms that it assumes, namely the world and all that is contained in it, these also cannot but be real -and not merely apparent.

Further, there is absolutely nothing in the Brahma Sutras which, interpreted independently of Sankara's commentary, lends any support to his peculiar theory of *Maya,* and Saxikara himself seems to be somewhat aware of this inasmuch as he draws very little upon the *Sutras* when he cites authorities in favour of his view. His commentary on the aphorisms is indeed full of his theory; but the expositions of his theory in the commentary are given rather in the form of independent remarks than direct explanations of the aphorisms. He indeed believes the author of the *Sutras* to be of his opinion and represents him as saying this or that from the standpoint occupied by himself; but to one who is not already imbued with Sankara-s principles, it is difficult to